DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 981 UD 027 494

AUTHOR Stanley, Cheryl
TITLE Magnet Schools. Thirteenth Annual Final Report, 1987-88.
INSTITUTION Houston Independent School District, TX. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 49p.; For later report, see UD 027 495.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Busing; Class Size; Compliance (Legal); Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditure per Student; *Magnet Schools; Minority Group Children; *Racial Composition; Racial Integration; *School Desegregation; Teacher Student Ratio; Teaching Experience; Urban Education; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Houston Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the success of the magnet school program in the Houston (Texas) Independent School District for the 1987-88 school year. The following sections are included: (1) "Overview of the District"; (2) "History of Desegregation in Houston"; (3) "Development of Houston's Magnet School Program"; (4) "Objectives Related to the Court Order"; and (5) "Information Required by the Settlement Agreement." Achievement of the following objectives is discussed: (1) reduction in the number of schools that are 90 percent or more White or combined Black and Hispanic; (2) reduction in the number of students attending schools that are 90 percent or more White or combined Black and Hispanic; (3) free transportation upon request to all students attending magnet schools outside their attendance zone; and (4) reports of student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group. This report provides the following information for each magnet school as required by the Settlement Agreement: (1) race or ethnicity; (2) per pupil expenditure; (3) achievement scores; (4) average class size; (5) student/teacher ratio; (6) teacher experience; and (7) waiting lists. The following findings are presented: (1) the number of ethnically isolated schools was reduced; (2) the number of students attending ethnically isolated schools was reduced; (3) 16,587 students were transported over the 1-year period for the purpose of desegregation; and (4) a total of 98,163 students were affected by magnet school programs. Twenty-four tables are included. A list of the magnet schools is appended. (JS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED320981

Magnet Schools
Thirteenth Annual Final Report
1987–88

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Cheryl Stanley
Houston Independent School District
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Department of Research and Evaluation
Houston Independent School District
3830 Richmond Avenue
Houston, Texas 77027

Joan M. Raymond, General Superintendent

UD 027 494

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Cathy Mincberg, President
Melody Ellis, Vice-President
Olga Gallegos, Secretary
Wiley E. Henry, Assistant Secretary
Paula Arnold
Felix Fraga
Ron Franklin
Don McAdams
Rod Paige

Magnet Schools
Thirteenth Annual Final Report
1987–88

Prepared by
Cheryl Stanley, Director
Administrative Research Bureau

Dr. Kathryn Sanchez, Assistant Superintendent
Department of Research and Evaluation
Houston Independent School District

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

Overview of the District 1

History of Desegregation in Houston 1

Development of Houston's Magnet School Program 2

Objectives Related to the Court Order 5

- Objective 1 5
- Objective 2 8
- Objective 3 12
- Objective 4 13

Information Required by the Settlement Agreement 23

Appendix 39

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1
Number and Percent of One-Race Schools by School Level from 1974–75 to 1987–88 6

Table 2
Number of One-Race Schools for 1987–88 by Race and Ethnicity and by Level 6

Table 3
One-Race Minority Elementary Magnet School Campuses, 1987-88 7

Table 4
One-Race Minority Secondary Magnet School Campuses, 1987–88 7

Table 5
Percentage of Students Attending One-Race Schools, 1974–75 to 1987–88 9

Table 6
District Enrollment and Ethnic Percentages, 1974–75 to 1987–88 10

Table 7
Number and Percentage of HISD Enrollment Compared to the Total Enrollment in All School Districts in Harris County for 1987–88 11

Table 8
Final Student Enrollment for Add-On (AOP) Magnet Programs, May 1988 14

Table 9
Final Student Enrollment for School-Within-A-School (SWAS) Magnet Programs, May 1988 15

Table 10
Final Student Enrollment for Separate and Unique (SUS) Magnet Schools, May 1988 17

Table 11
Final Student Participation for Cluster Center Magnet Programs, May 1988 17

Table 12
Final Student Enrollment in All Magnet Programs, May 1988 18

Table 13
SWAS Magnet Programs That Met Their Total Enrollment Goals, May 1988 19

Table 14
SWAS Magnet Programs That Met Their Ethnic and Racial Goals without Exceeding Black or Hispanic Percentage Ceilings, May 1988 20

Table 15
Percentages of White Enrollment at AOP Magnet Schools in May 1987 and May 1988.....22

Table 16
Percentages of White Enrollment at Separate and Unique Magnet Schools in May 1987 and May 1988.....23

Table 17
Student/Teacher Ratio and Teacher Experience, by Magnet School, 1987–88.....24

Table 18
The Number of Verbal Enrollment Denials In-District (HISD) and Out-of-District (non-HISD) by Race and Ethnicity, 1987–88.....26

Table 19
The Number of Students Placed on Waiting Lists and the Number of Verbal Enrollment Denials by Race and Ethnicity, 1987–88.....28

Table 20
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6) Median Grade Equivalent Scores for Reading Total and Math Total Subtests by Magnet Program, Spring 1988.....31

Table 21
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6) Median Grade Equivalent Scores for Reading Total and Math Total Subtests for Specialty Groupings, Spring 1988.....35

Table 22
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) Percent of Students Mastering Subtests, Grades 1, 3 and 5, Spring 1988.....35

Table 24
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) Percent of Students Mastering Subtests, Grades 9 and 11, Spring 1988.....38

Magnet Schools
Executive Summary
Thirteenth Annual Report
1987–88

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Magnet schools offer a special or enhanced curriculum to attract students districtwide within a specified ethnic ratio.

A total of 83 alternative educational programs have been established and operated during the 1987–88 school year. The 83 programs, located on 76 campuses, represent all grade levels, pre-kindergarten through 12, and range from fine arts to math/science, to extended instructional day, to gifted and talented.

This Magnet School Evaluation addresses the four objectives of the Magnet School Plan and provides information by Magnet school as required by the Settlement Agreement.

FINDINGS

Objectives Related to the Court Order

1. Reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

The number of ethnically isolated schools for 1987–88 was 115 as compared to 117 during the baseline year of 1974–75.

2. Reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

During the baseline year of 1974–75, 54.1% of the students in the district attended ethnically isolated schools. This past year only 45.4% were in this category.

3. Provide free transportation upon request to all students attending Magnet Schools outside their regular school attendance zone.

The Transportation Department reported transporting a total of 16,587 students for desegregation purposes this year. This total includes majority-to-minority transfer students. In addition, 972 transportation agreements were issued.

4. Report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet School biannually.

A total of 98,163 students were affected directly or indirectly by Magnet school programs. Total full-time enrollment in Magnet school programs was 31,643 students. The overall makeup of the Magnet school student population including participants of cluster centers was 34% Black, 32% Hispanic and 34% White. Excluding cluster center participants, the ethnic makeup was 40% Black, 26% Hispanic and 34% White. Considering all students who benefitted from lowered student/teacher ratios and additional staff, the total number of students impacted by the Magnet School Program was 51.2% of the district's total enrollment. The district provides teacher assignment by ethnic group as part of the 1987–88 Annual Report, Settlement Agreement.

Information Required by the Settlement Agreement

The Settlement Agreement requires the following to be reported for each Magnet program and location: race or ethnicity, per pupil expenditure, achievement scores, average class size, student/teacher ratio, teacher experience and waiting lists. Average class size, per pupil expenditure, and student/professional staff ratio were not available this year.

Race or ethnicity — Of the 56 school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet programs, 35 met enrollment goals and 25 met ethnic goals. Of the 27 add-on programs (AOP) and separate and unique schools (SUS), 12 met ethnic goals.

Achievement scores — Overall, Magnet students in grades 1 through 8 scored at or above grade level on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6). A majority of the Magnet students passed each subtest of the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS).

Student/teacher ratio — The elementary figure represents the ratio of students (excluding special education students in self-contained special education classes) to all regularly assigned classroom teachers. Teachers excluded are pull-out program teachers, special education teachers and all federally funded teachers. For secondary schools, the figure represents the ratio of students (excluding special education students in self-contained special education classes) to all teaching staff excluding self-contained special education teachers. The ratio on elementary Magnet campuses ranges from 15.3 to 26.2 and on secondary Magnet campuses from 9.6 to 23.6.

Teacher experience — On Magnet campuses, the percent of teachers with over 10 years of experience ranged from 13% to 69%.

Waiting lists — The number of students placed on waiting lists or verbally denied admittance to a Magnet program because no vacancies existed ranged from 0 to 513.

MAGNET SCHOOLS
THIRTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT
1987–88

This report presents information regarding the achievement of the four objectives established by the Court Order which approved the implementation of Magnet schools in July, 1975. It also provides information required by the Settlement Agreement which ended the district's twenty-eight year old desegregation lawsuit.

Individual Magnet programs are evaluated using campus-based objectives. Final audits of program objectives are submitted to and reviewed by the Magnet evaluator.

The Magnet school programs, with their specialties, are listed in the appendix.

OVERVIEW OF THE DISTRICT

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) is the sixth largest school district in the United States, and it is the largest district in the South. It is located in southeast Texas in a region referred to as the Upper Texas Gulf Coastal Plain, about fifty miles northwest of the Port of Galveston on the Gulf of Mexico. The Houston Independent School District consists of 312 square miles which occupy the center of both the City of Houston and Harris County. The district has a student enrollment of approximately 191,831 which includes special service schools and is truly multi-ethnic. It is 0.1% American Indian, 2.9% Asian, 41.8% Black, 38.9% Hispanic and 16.3% White. The Houston Independent School District, one of 20 school districts in Harris County, includes 38.2% of the total public school enrollment of 501,727 in Harris County (See Table 6).

HISTORY OF DESEGREGATION IN HOUSTON

Prior to the United States Supreme Court decisions in Brown vs. The Board of Education, the Houston Independent School District existed as a dual school system, that is, there were specific schools reserved for Black and White students. Following the Brown I and II rulings, HISD went through a series of desegregation activities similar to those of most other southern school systems. The most recent of these activities has been an extensive Magnet School Plan.

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) began school desegregation in the fall of 1960 when it implemented a grade per year transfer plan. Subsequently, the district has been engaged in other

methods to achieve integration, e.g., freedom of choice (1967), and school pairing (1971). None of these methods achieved the desired results.

An indication of this failure can be seen in enrollment patterns under the 1971 pairing plan. When twenty-two schools in the Houston Independent School District were paired in September of 1971, the enrollment in the twenty-two schools was 16,733. By 1975, enrollment in the twenty-two schools was 15,419. Enrollment in the total district at the time of pairing was 231,922. The enrollment of students in Houston schools as of February 1, 1975, was 210,117.

Pairing did not promote integration. The pairing of schools affected 9,957 Black students, 4,923 Hispanic students, and 539 White students. Hispanic students were counted as "White." This classification implied that minority students were paired with majority students. In reality, minority students (Black) were paired with minority students (Hispanic).

The HISD Magnet School Program, Phase I, was formally implemented with the beginning of the 1975–76 school year in compliance with the Amended Decree of September 18, 1970, by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. This amended action, designated Civil Action No. 10444, dated July 11, 1975, provided for the depairing of twenty-two (22) elementary schools, the restoration of the paired schools' original equidistant zone lines, and the implementation of the Magnet School Plan.

DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSTON'S MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAM

The Magnet School Program in Houston was the result of careful study and planning. It began with an action by the Board of Trustees of the Houston Independent School District which established a Task Force on Quality Integrated Education. This task force, established in December, 1974, was directed to seek out and recommend an alternative, or alternatives, to forced school pairing as a desegregation method for the Houston Independent School District. They visited several cities with successful desegregation plans in operation. Not all of the cities visited used Magnet schools; in fact, very few of them did, but these few cities were those that the task force felt had the most exciting and truly successful plans for integrating students of different ethnic groups.

In February, 1975, the task force presented the Board with its initial recommendations. The primary recommendation was that the Houston Independent School District establish a network of alternative programs or "centers of excellence." These programs, by providing high quality instruction in special areas and the basic skills, would attract students from all ethnic groups and areas of the district, thereby creating quality education in integrated settings.

Soon after the task force made its initial recommendations, the Board of Trustees of the Houston Independent School District established an administrative support team to assist the task force in putting its recommendations into action. This support team, headed by an assistant superintendent and made up of principals, counselors, and instructional specialists from throughout the district, was charged with the responsibility of designing programs that would qualify as "centers of excellence" and be economically feasible as well. The support team was to draw up initial program specifications, objectives, action steps, and budgets and to establish procedures whereby personnel could be appointed to these programs and students could be recruited.

When the administrative support team had finished its work, it presented to the Board initial program designs and installation budgets for approximately 40 Magnet programs. From these, on the administration's recommendation, 32 programs were to be implemented during the 1975–76 school year, with the remaining programs to begin the next year. The Board of Trustees then instructed its legal representatives to present this new plan to the Federal District Court as an alternative to the school pairing plan.

The Federal District Court heard the district's presentation on June 2, 1975. On July 12, 1975, the Federal District Court approved substitution of the recommended Magnet School Program for the district's school pairing plan. This adoption date gave the district five weeks to dismantle a pairing plan involving 22 schools, assign and/or hire 32 Magnet school staffs at 29 different campuses, market the programs, and enroll students in the programs.

The Magnet School Plan as presented to the court and subsequently approved in July, 1975, included the following four objectives:

1. Reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.
2. Reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.
3. Provide free transportation upon request to all students attending Magnet Schools outside their regular school attendance zone.
4. Report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet School biannually.

Six people (three field information coordinators, two Magnet school program administrators, and an assistant superintendent) directed the implementation of the Magnet School Program. This included establishing new transportation routes to accommodate Magnet school transfer students.

In 1979, after many years of successful integration efforts, HISD petitioned the court to be declared unitary, that is, that no vestiges of a dual system remain. On September 28, 1979, the court directed the Texas Education Agency (TEA):

> to make a study identifying and evaluating the educational challenges faced by HISD and other urban school districts... (and)... to develop a plan to meet these challenges which will provide for the voluntary cooperation and sharing of educational opportunities, with the goal of educational enrichment for both urban and suburban students.

The court directed the TEA to file a report by April 1, 1980, and directed HISD to "provide the TEA with appropriate data and otherwise assist the TEA with the development of the study." On April 1, 1980, the TEA submitted a response, the Voluntary Interdistrict Education Plan (VIEP). On July 17, 1980, the court received the "1980–81 Implementation Activities of the Plan Submitted by the Texas Education Agency." The HISD participates in the VIEP as the receiving district by enrolling students from surrounding districts in the Magnet schools.

A second Magnet School Task Force composed of community and HISD personnel began meeting in the fall of 1980 to determine needs for expansion or redirection of the Magnet Program in order to maximize integration efforts and better accommodate the VIEP. On June 17, 1981, Judge Robert O'Conor declared the Houston Independent School District unitary and retained jurisdiction of the case on the inactive docket for three years. On March 1, 1982, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) filed a request for oral argument in the process of appeals. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed Judge O'Conor's ruling on February 16, 1983.

At the end of the three year period in the summer of 1984, a public hearing was held. A settlement agreement to remain in effect for a term of five (5) years, was signed on September 10, 1984, by the parties of the lawsuit. On November 26, 1984, Judge John V. Singleton approved an Order of Dismissal of the lawsuit and an Order Approving the Settlement Agreement.

The following section of this report will address the four objectives from the original court order.

OBJECTIVES RELATED TO THE COURT ORDER

Objective 1: HISD will reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

Racially Isolated Schools

The number of one-race schools in 1974–75 was 117. For 1987–88, the number of one-race schools districtwide, 115, has risen to the highest level since the baseline year. This can be attributed in part to the district's shifting racial and ethnic populations (see Tables 5 and 6).

In order to determine the degree to which this objective has been met, the number and percent of schools which were one-race (i.e., 90% or more White, Black, Hispanic or combined Black and Hispanic) during the last year of the school pairing plan (1974–75) must be compared to similar figures for Phase XIII (1987–88) of the Magnet School Plan. The Texas Education Agency Fall Membership Survey 1987–88 was used to prepare this section of the report. For purposes of desegregation, White is defined as all races that are not Black or Hispanic. Table 1 presents the data for the last year of school pairing, 1974–75, and for each of the thirteen years of implementation of the Magnet School Plan.

Table 1 includes all schools in the district except special education schools and programs. A special program school was not counted unless there was a separate principal for the program. Secondary schools with grades 7–12 were counted as one school if they were on a single campus with one principal.

The total number and percent of one-race schools increased by one for 1987–88 as compared to 1986–87. The number and percent of one-race schools increased at the elementary level this year compared to last year. All the one-race schools are one-race minority schools. There has not been a one-race White school since 1983–84.

Table 1
Number and Percent of One-Race Schools by School Level from 1974–75 to 1987–88

School Year	Elementary			Junior/Middle			Senior			All Schools		
	Total Schools	One-Race Schools		Total Schools	One-Race Schools		Total Schools	One-Race Schools		Total Schools	One-Race Schools	
		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%
1974–75 Baseline	170	87	51.2	31	16	51.6	29	4	8.3	230	117	50.9
1975–76	169	81	47.9	32	13	40.6	31	13	41.9	232	107	46.1
1976–77	169	78	46.2	31	12	38.7	32	12	37.5	232	102	44.0
1977–78	169	76	45.0	30	12	38.9	32	11	34.4	231	99	42.9
1978–79	170	79	46.5	31	13	41.9	32	11	34.4	233	103	44.2
1979–80	169	76	45.0	34	14	41.2	32	13	40.6	235	103	43.8
1980–81	168	81	48.2	34	14	41.2	31	12	38.7	233	107	45.9
1981–82	167	82	49.1	34	14	41.2	32	12	37.5	233	108	46.4
1982–83	167	79	47.3	34	14	41.2	32	13	40.6	233	106	45.5
1983–84	167	80	47.9	34	15	44.1	32	14	43.8	233	109	46.8
1984–85	166	81	48.8	34	15	44.1	32	14	43.8	232	110	47.4
1985–86	166	83	50.0	34	16	47.1	32	14	43.8	232	113	48.7
1986–87	166	83	50.0	34	16	47.1	32	15	46.9	232	114	49.1
1987–88	166	84	50.6	34	16	47.1	33	15	45.5	233	115	49.4

Table 2 presents the number of one-race schools for 1987–88 by race and ethnicity and by level.

Table 2
Number of One-Race Schools for 1987–88 by Race and Ethnicity and by Level

	One-Race Black Schools (90% or More Black Enrollment)	One-Race Hispanic Schools (90% or More Hispanic Enrollment)	One-Race Minority Schools (90% or More Black and Hispanic Combined)		Total
			At least 45% Black	At least 45% Hispanic	
Elementary	32	18	20	14	84
Middle	7	2	4	3	16
Senior	3	1	9	2	15
Total	42	21	33	19	115

The number of one-race Black schools decreased by two, but the number of one-race minority schools with at least 45% Black enrollment increased by one and one-race minority schools with at least 45%

Hispanic enrollment increased by two. For 1987–88 the total number of one-race schools increased by one.

Racially Isolated Magnet Schools

Of the 74 full-time Magnet school campuses (excluding Cluster Centers), eleven elementary schools, two middle schools and seven high school Magnet campuses were classified as one-race minority schools using the 1987 TEA Fall Survey. This is an increase of four Magnet schools in the one-race category.

It should be noted that of the 20 one-race Magnet school campuses, 15 have Magnet programs which are school-within-a-school.

Elementary: Of the 45 elementary Magnet school campuses (excluding Cluster Centers), eleven were classified one-race minority schools, i.e., 90% or more minority enrollment. They are listed in Table 3. Of these eleven, seven are school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnets and five are add-on programs (AOP) serving the total school. One school has both types of programs on the campus.

Table 3
One-Race Minority Elementary Magnet School Campuses, 1987–88

Berry (AOP)	Dow (SWAS)	Lockhart (SWAS and AOP)
Bruce (AOP)	Anson Jones (SWAS)	Pugh (AOP)
Burrus (SWAS)	Lantrip (SWAS)	Ross (SWAS)
DeZavala†	Law (AOP)	

† New Magnet School

The elementary schools classified as one-race have varied somewhat over the last few years. However, for the last four years, Berry, Burrus, Lantrip, Lockhart, Pugh and Ross have been classified as one-race schools.

Secondary: Of the 29 secondary Magnet schools, nine were classified one-race minority schools. These are listed in Table 4.

Table 4
One-Race Minority Secondary Magnet School Campuses, 1987–88

Austin (SWAS)	Jones (SWAS)	Sterling (SWAS)
Davis (SWAS)	Jordan (SUS)	B.T. Washington (SWAS)
Fleming (SWAS)	Ryan (SWAS) †	Yates (SWAS)

† New Magnet School

Of the secondary schools listed above in Table 4, the following have been one-race minority schools for the last five years: Austin, Davis, Fleming, Jones, Jordan, Sterling, Washington, and Yates (i.e., all except the new Magnet school, Ryan).

Objective 2: HISD will reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

Reviewing the data for the past fourteen years shows that in the latter half of the 1970's, the first years after implementation of the Magnet school program, significant impact on integration was evident in terms of reducing the number of one-race schools and reducing the number of students attending one-race schools. The number of one race schools declined from 117 (50% of all schools) in 1974–75 to 103 (43% of all schools) in 1979–80, while the number of students attending one-race schools declined from 54% of the student population in 1974–75 to a low of 45% in 1978-79. Since that time the percentage of students in one-race schools has remained almost constant (45% in 1987–88) while the number and percent of schools that are one-race has slowly increased almost to the baseline level (115 schools or 49%). The latter phenomenon is most probably a function of the constantly declining enrollment, especially of White students, changing previously integrated schools into one-race minority as well as the declining enrollment in traditionally black schools, which remain one-race but contribute fewer students to the one-race category. A dramatic increase in the district's White enrollment would be needed to substantially increase integration throughout the district.

In 1974–75, 114,143 students or 54.1% attended one-race schools. The October 1987 TEA Fall Membership Survey indicates that 87,048 students, or 45.4%, attended one-race schools in 1987–88, a decrease of 3,136 students from the 90,184 students who attended one-race schools in 1986–87.

The percent of students enrolled in one-race schools in HISD is presented in Table 5. The data reveal that a smaller percentage of students are attending one-race schools now as compared to the 1974–75 baseline period. After a decline with the initiation of Magnet schools, the percentage of students attending one-race schools appears to be stabilizing.

Table 5
Percentage of Students Attending One-Race Schools, 1974–75 to 1987–88

	Elementary	Middle/Junior High	Senior High	Total
1974–75 Baseline	56.9%	44.1%	58.3%	54.1%
1975–76	54.4%	34.1%	52.8%	49.0%
1976–77	51.6%	34.6%	46.0%	46.3%
1977–78	50.9%	34.8%	41.2%	45.0%
1978–79	50.8%	37.7%	36.4%	44.8%
1979–80	48.5%	39.5%	43.2%	45.4%
1980–81	50.1%	37.5%	39.3%	45.0%
1981–82	51.7%	37.8%	38.0%	45.5%
1982–83	49.6%	39.6%	38.4%	44.8%
1983–84	49.5%	44.2%	45.4%	47.3%
1984–85	48.9%	42.4%	45.5%	46.5%
1985–86	49.8%	45.8%	41.0%	46.8%
1986–87	48.3%	44.8%	42.5%	46.2%
1987–88	48.3%	40.8%	42.6%	45.4%

District enrollment has changed in the last ten years; therefore, examination of the district's enrollment and the percentage of students in one-race schools is more meaningful. The district enrollment and ethnic percentages are provided in Table 6. The figures were taken directly from the TEA Fall Surveys of each year. The numbers shown represent all students enrolled in the district, including special education students.

Table 6
District Enrollment and Ethnic Percentages, 1974–75 to 1987–88

	Black		Hispanic		Asian		White/Am. Ind.		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1974–75 Baseline	88,804	42.0	40,227	19.0	845	0.4	81,698	38.6	211,574
1975–76	90,034	42.6	42,962	20.3	1,014	0.5	77,398	36.6	211,408
1976–77	90,635	43.2	45,743	21.8	1,702	0.8	71,945	34.3	210,025
1977–78	91,157	44.0	47,128	22.8	2,194	1.1	66,519	32.1	206,998
1978–79	90,872	45.0	48,877	24.2	2,730	1.4	59,481	29.5	201,960
1979–80	87,797	45.3	49,639	25.6	3,253	1.7	53,217	27.4	193,906
1980–81	87,102	44.9	53,917	27.8	4,095	2.1	48,929	25.2	194,043
1981–82	85,834	44.3	57,558	29.7	5,103	2.6	45,207	23.3	193,702
1982–83	85,679	44.1	60,193	31.0	6,269	3.2	42,298	21.8	194,439
1983–84	83,592	44.1	61,424	32.4	5,824	3.1	38,627	20.4	189,467
1984–85	81,493	43.6	63,950	34.2	5,843	3.1	35,745	19.1	187,031
1985–86	83,423	43.0	69,874	36.0	6,352	3.3	34,240	17.7	193,889
1986–87	82,763	42.5	72,856	37.4	5,883	3.0	33,065	17.0	194,567
1987–88	80,274	41.8	74,608	38.9	5,477	2.9	31,472	16.4	191,831

Since 1975–76 the district enrollment decreased steadily for ten years. The number and percentage of White students has continued to decrease since 1975–76 to the present. Presently, only 14.0% of all the White students enrolled in Harris County public schools are enrolled in HISD. Table 7 presents the number and percentage of HISD's enrollment compared to that of all 20 school districts in Harris County (including HISD). American Indian students comprise approximately 0.1% of both HISD and Harris County and were combined with White students in the table. Table 7 shows that HISD has over 50% of both the Black and Hispanic and only 14% of the White public school population in Harris County. There are only two other school districts in Harris County with more than 50% Black and Hispanic students combined.

Table 7
Number and Percentage of HISD Enrollment Compared to the Total Enrollment in All School Districts in Harris County for 1987–88

Race/Ethnicity	HISD	Harris County	Percentage
Black	80,274	127,669	62.9
Hispanic	74,608	128,234	58.2
Asian	5,477	21,483	25.5
White/Am. Ind.	31,472	224,341	14.0
Total	191,831	501,727	38.2

Of the 115 one-race schools, all had student enrollments which were 90% or more Black and/or Hispanic students. A total of 84,596 Black and Hispanic students were enrolled in these 115 one-race minority schools during 1987–88. This total represents 54.8% of the 154,464 Black and Hispanic students enrolled in all HISD schools. This is 1.1 percent less than last year.

Objective 3: HISD will provide free transportation upon request to all students attending Magnet schools outside their attendance zone.

The District Court decree allowing implementation of the Magnet School Plan required the district to provide free transportation to students attending a Magnet school outside their attendance zone. To determine whether the district was providing free transportation to Magnet school students, a brief questionnaire was sent to the Transportation Department to gather the following data:

1. Total number of students transported in HISD, by race;
2. Total number of Magnet students transported, by race;
3. Total number of transportation vehicles used and total number of transportation vehicles used to transport Magnet students;
4. Total number of transportation routes and runs (trips) number of routes and runs used to transport Magnet students;
5. Transportation costs per mile;
6. Approximate annual cost per student for Magnet school students and for non-Magnet school students; and
7. Total number of transportation agreements.

During the 1987–1988 school year, the Transportation Department reported transporting 28,315 students (51.1% Black, 24.0% Hispanic, and 24.8% White/Other). The number of students transported increased by 296 students over last year. Of the total number of students transported, 16,587 (50.4% Black, 23.8% Hispanic, and 25.8% White) were transported for desegregation purposes. This total includes majority-to-minority (M to M) transfer students who attend Magnet school campuses but who are not enrolled in the Magnet school program.

Since the Transportation Department does not separate M to M transfer students in their record keeping, it is not possible to specify precisely what proportion of Magnet school transfer students were transported. The Transportation Department indicated that every effort is made to transport all Magnet school students who apply before the June deadline. After bus routes are established in the summer, students are provided transportation as room on the bus routes is available.

The Transportation Department also utilizes transportation agreements in certain cases where bus transportation is not available. This transportation agreement allows the district to reimburse the parent/guardian for transporting his/her child to school. To be eligible, the student must meet the state's guidelines. Only one transportation agreement is issued per parent or residence. During 1987–88, 972 transportation agreements were issued. This is an increase of 179 over last year.

The Transportation Department utilized a total of 838 school buses, of which 452 were used to transport Magnet and Majority to Minority transfer students. Each operational bus has one route. At any point in time, many buses are being serviced or repaired or have been retired from operation due to their condition. The cost per mile for bus transportation for Magnet students and M to M students was $1.49. During the 1987–88 school year, the annual cost of transporting Magnet and M to M transfer students was $548.00 per student as compared to $104.00 per regular student and $1,221.21 per special education student. These costs are based on the total miles traveled for the year.

The greater cost per student for Magnet school transportation provides an additional indication of the district's commitment to provide transportation to as many Magnet students as possible.

Objective 4: HISD will report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet school biannually.

The district provides student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group as part of the annual report presented to the Equity/Quality Assurance Committee, the Parties to the Settlement Agreement, and the public. Student enrollment in Magnet programs is presented in this report.

Magnet ethnic enrollment goals are not the same for all programs. Magnet schools are divided geographically into two groups: In-Town Consortium and Satellite. The borders for the In-Town Consortium Schools are Loop 610 on the west and south, Highway 288 on the east and Buffalo Bayou on the north. All other Magnet schools are designated Satellite schools.

In-Town Consortium Schools had the goal of 50% minority and 50% White for 1984–85. As a result of the Settlement Agreement, beginning with the 1985–86 school year, the ethnic goal for In-Town Consortium Schools was 60% minority and 40% White for the incoming grades, adding an additional grade each year. The district's ethnic goals are different for each group of schools. Satellite Magnet schools have the ethnic goal of 35% white and 65% minority.

Within the minority ratio for all Magnet schools, neither minority group is to exceed the districtwide percentage of representation for that race or ethnicity as calculated in the previous year's official enrollment, that is, during 1987–88, the participation rate for Black students was not to exceed 42.5%, and the participation rate for Hispanic students was not to exceed 37.5%.

Ethnic ratios are allowed to fluctuate to 65% White/Other and 35% Minority after July 1, based on student interest in the program. Ten percent of the vacancies must remain available.

Student enrollment in Magnet schools is summarized in the following five tables (8–12). These data represent actual student enrollment in May, 1988, as reported by Magnet coordinators in their final audits.

Table 8
Final Student Enrollment for Add-On (AOP) Magnet Programs, May 1988

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	
ELEMENTARY								
Bell	202	31	61	9	40	391	60	654
Berry	225	23	707	72	95	44	5	976
Bruce	284	72	73	19	91	35	9	392
Codwell	415	85	1	<1	85	72	15	488
Elrod	709	71	81	8	79	212	21	1,002
Garden Villas	346	42	203	25	67	267	33	816
* Horn	122	25	84	17	42	279	58	485
Law	476	98	8	2	99	3	<1	487
Lockhart	554	97	3	<1	97	15	3	572
* Longfellow	241	46	80	15	61	203	39	524
Lovett	243	42	61	10	52	278	48	582
* MacGregor	293	68	76	18	85	63	15	432
* Poe	151	20	220	29	48	399	52	770
Pugh	9	1	731	92	93	58	7	798
* Roberts	166	35	116	25	60	186	40	468
* Rogers, W	210	38	177	32	69	170	31	557
* West University	138	14	81	8	21	800	79	1,019
Subtotal	4,633	45	2,543	25	70	3,076	30	10,252
MIDDLE								
Clifton	393	30	461	35	66	446	34	1,300
Revere	396	21	535	28	49	962	51	1,893
Subtotal	789	25	996	31	56	1,408	44	3,193
SENIOR								
Reagan	279	18	984	64	83	265	17	1,528
Total Add-On	5,701	38	4,523	30	68	4,749	32	14,973

* In-Town Consortium Magnet Schools 60% Minority/40% White
Satellite Magnet Schools 65% Minority/35% White

Table 9
Final Student Enrollment for School-Within-A-School (SWAS)
Magnet Programs, May 1988

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total	Goal
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N	N
ELEMENTARY									
Askew	53	19	23	8	28	198	72	274	264
Burbank	55	31	57	32	63	65	37	177	180
Burrus	145	73	41	21	94	12	6	198	225
Cornelius	93	34	84	31	64	98	36	275	270
† DeZavala	10	19	35	67	87	7	13	52	78
* Dodson	64	33	56	29	62	75	38	195	200
Dow	64	51	32	26	77	29	23	125	125
Durham	96	48	36	18	66	69	34	201	200
† Herod	22	15	12	8	23	113	77	147	154
Jones, A	34	31	54	50	81	20	19	108	120
* Jones, JW	76	45	33	20	65	59	35	168	175
Kolter	126	42	62	21	63	110	37	298	300
Lantrip	37	31	44	37	68	39	33	120	119
Lockhart	89	87	2	2	89	11	11	102	125
Lovett	134	51	32	12	63	99	37	265	250
* MacGregor	45	48	2	2	50	47	50	94	100
Oak Forest	76	42	40	22	64	66	36	182	188
Parker	146	42	81	23	65	123	35	350	350
Pleasantville	108	45	36	15	61	94	39	238	250
Red	52	58	4	4	62	34	38	90	100
* River Oaks	153	30	114	22	52	248	48	515	511
* Roberts	61	44	18	13	57	60	43	139	150
Rogers, TH	103	23	57	13	36	284	64	444	482
* Rogers, W	154	56	13	5	61	108	39	275	275
Roosevelt	53	36	37	25	62	56	38	146	144
Ross	89	63	33	23	87	19	13	141	141
Scroggins	50	28	65	37	65	62	35	177	175
† Travis	5	9	23	43	52	26	48	54	66
* Twain	70	41	23	13	54	79	46	172	175
Wainwright	56	31	64	35	66	62	34	182	175
* Whidby	51	41	13	11	52	59	48	123	120
* Wilson	49	32	42	27	59	63	41	154	150
Windsor Village	116	42	29	10	52	134	48	279	288
Subtotal	2,686	37	1,517	21	58	3,027	42	7,230	
MIDDLE									
Burbank	82	31	90	34	65	91	35	263	275
Clifton	117	30	122	31	60	157	40	396	400
Fleming	165	57	79	27	84	48	16	292	350

Table 9 Cont'd.

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total	Goal
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N	N
Fondren	24	29	10	12	41	49	59	83	150
* Gregory-Lincoln	89	39	58	25	64	83	36	230	250
Hamilton	97	36	91	34	70	79	30	267	275
Hartman	112	40	90	32	73	76	27	278	300
‡ Holland	38	37	23	22	59	43	41	104	100
Johnston	292	49	93	16	64	215	36	600	600
* Lanier	204	32	118	19	51	314	49	636	725
* Pershing	185	40	59	13	52	221	48	465	425
† Ryan	117	95	2	2	97	4	3	123	100
Welch	133	43	59	19	63	114	37	306	300
Subtotal	1,655	41	894	22	63	1,494	37	4,043	
SENIOR									
Austin	31	19	118	73	93	12	7	161	200
Bellaire	88	21	99	23	44	241	56	428	600
Davis	30	19	106	66	85	24	15	160	250
Jones	135	56	30	12	68	78	32	243	300
* Lamar	264	43	73	12	55	280	45	617	600
Milby	36	12	196	65	77	70	23	302	350
Reagan	117	36	125	39	75	79	25	321	300
Sterling	21	16	34	27	43	73	57	128	160
Washington	271	73	42	11	85	56	15	369	500
Yates	259	83	11	4	87	41	13	311	300
Subtotal	1,252	41	834	27	69	954	31	3,040	
Total SWAS	5,593	39	3,245	23	62	5,475	38	14,313	

* In-Town Consortium Magnet Schools: 60% Minority/40% White
Satellite Magnet Schools: 65% Minority/35% White
† New Magnet program
‡ First year for Magnet program redirection

Table 10
Final Student Enrollment for Separate and Unique (SUS) Magnet Schools, May 1988

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N
MIDDLE								
* Contemporary Lrng Ctr	88	68	28	22	90	13	10	129
SENIOR								
* Contemporary Lrng Ctr	348	76	45	10	85	67	15	460
*† Foley's Academy	28	35	25	32	67	26	33	79
* Health Professions	377	50	113	15	65	263	35	753
Jordan	959	81	207	17	98	22	2	1,188
Law Enforcement	247	40	210	34	73	167	27	624
* Performing& VslArts	97	17	60	10	27	430	73	587
Subtotal	2,056	54	660	17	71	975	26	3,820
Total SUS	2,144	54	688	17	72	988	25	3,949

* In-Town Consortium Magnet Schools: 60% Minority/40% White
Satellite Magnet Schools: 65% Minority/35% White

† New Magnet program

Table 11
Final Student Participation for Cluster Center
Magnet Programs, May 1988

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	Served
Career World	1,100	33	1,096	33	66	1,155	34	3,351
Children's Literature	1,035	30	1,021	29	59	1,437	41	3,491
International Trade	1,162	35	959	29	64	1,203	36	3,324
Outdoor Ed – Cullen	974	37	795	30	67	882	33	2,651
Outdoor Ed – Olympia	1,637	35	1,719	37	73	1,264	27	4,620
People Place	2,155	33	2,090	32	65	2,285	35	6,530
Wildlife Discovery	887	36	905	36	72	706	28	2,498
Total Cluster	8,950	34	8,585	32	66	8,932	34	26,465

Table 12
Final Student Enrollment* in All Magnet Programs, May 1988

	Black		Hispanic		Total Minority	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	Participation
Elementary	6,836	41	3,993	24	65	5,778	35	16,607
Middle	2,415	35	1,796	26	60	2,758	40	6,969
Senior	3,470	43	2,353	29	72	2,115	26	8,067
Subtotal	12,721	40	8,142	26	66	10,651	34	31,643
Cluster	8,950	34	8,585	32	66	8,932	34	26,465
Grand Total	21,671	37	16,727	29	66	19,583	34	58,108

* Adjusted so that a student enrolled in a Magnet School with an AOP and SWAS program is not counted twice.

District Ethnic Goals Across All Magnet Programs

The data reported in Tables 8 through 12 suggest that, taken as a whole, the several categories of Magnet school programs were successful in attracting students from the district's three ethnic groups. Transfer students leave their home schools to transfer to Magnet schools or they participate in their home school's school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet program. Of the 22,502 Magnet school transfer students reported in the May 15, 1988 Student Transfer Report, 9,885 students (43.9%) were Black, 4,922 students (21.9%) were Hispanic, and 7,695 students (34.2%) were White. The combined Black and Hispanic enrollment was 65.8%. The total number of Magnet transfer students includes 1,675 VIEP (Voluntary Interdistrict Education Plan) students who do not reside in HISD but transfer into HISD as part of this plan. Of the 1,675 VIEP transfer students, 883, or 52.7%, were White.

A total of 31,643 students were enrolled as full time students in Magnet schools. Of these, 12,721 (40.2%) were Black students, 8,142 (25.7%) were Hispanic students and 10,651 (33.7%) were White students. The total percentage of minority students (Black and Hispanic combined) was 65.9%.

In addition to the 31,643 full time Magnet students, 26,465 students participated in Cluster Center Magnet programs. Examples of the content taught in cluster centers include international trade, children's literature, career awareness, multicultural awareness, outdoor education/ecology and wildlife.

In theory, students from racially isolated schools attend classes for 3, 4, or 5 days in the cluster centers, which are comprised of students representing the three races and ethnicities in the district. Cluster centers ask schools to send a specific number of students in each race or ethnic group. Schools select students to participate by sending a whole class or by sending representatives from the different

classes in the school. In some instances, when representatives are selected, the students have the responsibility of reporting their experience back to the class. Most coordinators are not directly involved in the selection of students for participation and are therefore unable to control the exact percentages in which each race or ethnic group participates in the cluster center.

Campuses on which Magnet schools are located receive several benefits from the Magnet School Program. Pupil/teacher ratios on secondary campuses are lowered to 26:1 in academic classes and 21:1 in specialty classes. Additional curriculum specialists and support personnel are assigned to Magnet school campuses, and funds for additional material and supplies are allotted. Students who attend school on a campus which also houses a Magnet school share in these benefits. A total of 40,055 non-Magnet students received these indirect Magnet school benefits this year.

The education of a total of 98,163 students was impacted both directly and indirectly by HISD's Magnet School Program. These students represented 51.2% of the district's total enrollment. These data, together with data related to individual Magnet schools, indicate that the Magnet School Program was successful in attracting and serving a multi-ethnic student population.

Enrollment and Ethnic Goals for Individual Magnet Programs

School-Within-a-School Magnet Programs

Of the 33 elementary and 23 secondary school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet programs, 24 elementary and 11 secondary programs were within 5% of the total enrollment goal for their program. These schools are listed in Table 13.

Table 13
SWAS Magnet Programs That Met Their Total Enrollment Goals, May 1988

Elementary		
Askew	Kolter	Roosevelt
Burbank	Lantrip	Ross
Cornelius	Lovett	Scroggins
Dodson *	Oak Forest	Twain *
Dow	Parker	Wainwright
Durham	Pleasantville	Whidby *
Herod †	River Oaks *	Wilson *
J.W. Jones *	W. Rogers *	Windsor Village

Table 13 Cont'd.

Secondary	
Burbank Middle	Pershing Middle *
Clifton Middle	Reagan High
Hamilton Middle	Ryan Middle †
Holland Middle ‡	Welch Middle
Johnston Middle	Yates High
Lamar High *	

* In-Town Consortium School
† New Magnet program
‡ First year for Magnet program redirection

One-race campuses that have a school-within-a-school Magnet program operate under special transfer considerations. On a one-race campus, transfer policy allows the transfer of students in an ethnic group that would integrate the campus to be increased to 10% of the school's total enrollment. Magnet minority percentages are adjusted downward proportionately.

Of the 33 elementary and 23 secondary school-within-a-school (SWAS) Magnet programs, 18 elementary and 7 secondary programs were within ±5% of the district's ethnic goals of 35% White and 65% minority for Satellite schools and 60% minority and 40% White for In-Town Consortium Schools. Of the 56 SWAS campuses, 11 elementary and 4 secondary SWAS Magnet programs were within the ±5% variance, with the percentage of Black and Hispanic students not exceeding the prescribed ceilings of 42.5% Black and 37.5% Hispanic. These schools are listed below in Table 14.

Table 14
SWAS Magnet Programs That Met Their Ethnic and Racial Goals
without Exceeding Black or Hispanic Percentage Ceilings,
May 1988

Elementary	
Burbank	Roosevelt
Cornelius	Scroggins
Kolter	Twain *
Lantrip	Wainwright
Oak Forest	Wilson *
Parker	

Secondary	
Burbank Middle	Gregory-Lincoln Middle *
Clifton Middle	Lamar High *

* In-Town Consortium School

Several schools have been allowed to increase the White enrollment over the prescribed percentage in order to bring the school out of the one-race school category. Those which have been successful are Dodson Elementary, MacGregor Elementary and Whidby Elementary.

The following schools met their total ethnic goals but exceeded the percentage of Black or Hispanic students within the total minority percentage, that is, exceeded 42.5% Black or 37.5% Hispanic:

Durham Elementary
Jones, JW Elementary *
Lovett Elementary
Pleasantville Elementary
Red Elementary
Roberts Elementary *
Rogers, W Elementary *
Johnston Middle
Welch Middle
Jones High

* In-Town Consortium School

Add-On-Programs and Separate and Unique School Magnets

An add-on-program (AOP) is one where the Magnet specialty is added to the regular school curriculum. The students impacted on these campuses comprise the total enrollment of the school. A separate and unique Magnet provides a unique curriculum and single educational focus for all students in the school. All students in a separate and unique Magnet school are transfer students; there is no zoned home school population.

Magnet school transfer policy for 100% Magnet schools states, "The goal at each school with an add-on program or which is a separate and unique school is to achieve the most integration possible." Further, the following paragraph of the Magnet school transfer policy states, "Most Add-on Programs and Separate and Unique schools add the goal of decreasing the number of one-race schools. Some . . . are designed primarily to help stabilize a school's integrated enrollment." These two goals can be measured.

In order to measure "the most integration possible," the 1987–88 ethnic percentages of add-on and separate and unique programs were compared to the previous year's ethnic percentages. If a Magnet program maintained its previous year's ethnic percentages or moved closer to the district's racial and ethnic goal for In-Town Consortium and Satellite schools, the program was said to have met its recruitment goal.

Of the twenty AOP Magnet schools, five elementary schools were classified as one-race schools in 1987–88, based on May enrollment figures. The five schools were Berry, Bruce, Law, Lockhart, and

Pugh. Twelve Magnet add-on programs maintained or improved their ethnic ratios. The percentages of White enrollment for May 1987 and May 1988 are presented for all AOP Magnet schools in Table 15.

Table 15
Percentages of White Enrollment at AOP Magnet Schools
in May 1987 and May 1988

AOP/Total Magnets	% White Enrollment May 1987	May 1988	% Change
Bell	64	60	−4
Berry	6	5	−1
Bruce	10	9	−1
Codwell	13	15	+2
Elrod	25	21	−4
Garden Villas	35	33	−2
Horn *	52	58	+6
Law	2	<1	−1
Lockhart	1	13	+2
Longfellow *	41	39	−2
Lovett	49	48	−1
MacGregor *	15	15	0
Pugh	9	7	−2
Roberts *	39	40	+1
Rogers, W*	26	31	+5
Clifton	35	34	−1
Revere	58	51	−7
Reagan	18	17	−1

* In-Town Consortium School

Of the seven separate and unique (SUS) Magnet schools, one (Jordan) is classified as a one-race minority school. Six high schools maintained or improved their ethnic ratios: CLC, Foley's Academy Health Professions, HSPVA, Jordan, and Law Enforcement. Table 16 lists all SUS Magnet schools with their percentage of White enrollment for the past two years.

Table 16
Percentages of White Enrollment at Separate and Unique Magnet Schools
in May 1987 and May 1988

Separate and Unique	% White Enrollment May 1987	% White Enrollment May 1988	% Change
CLC Middle *	16	10	– 6
CLC Senior *	14	15	+ 1
Foley's Academy * †	24	33	+ 9
Health Professions *	35	35	0
Performing & Visual Arts *	73	73	0
Jordan	2	2	0
Law Enforcement	27	27	0

* In-Town Consortium School
† New Magnet school for 1987–88

Of the 27 add-on and separate and unique programs, 13 met the goal of maintaining or improving racial/ethnic percentages.

INFORMATION REQUIRED BY THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Settlement Agreement requires that the following information be provided in this report: ". . . per pupil expenditures, race or ethnicity, achievement scores, average class size, student/teacher ratios, teacher experience and waiting lists for each magnet program and location."

Race or ethnicity enrollment by Magnet program is presented in Tables 8–12. Table 17 provides data on student/teacher ratio and teacher experience. Per pupil expenditure, average class size and student/professional staff ratio were not available this year.

The student/teacher ratio is the average number of students per classroom teacher at each school excluding special education classes. This information was obtained from the *1987–88 District and School Profiles*. Teacher experience is based upon the number of years of experience in HISD as well as in other districts.

Table 17
Student/Teacher Ratio and Teacher Experience,
by Magnet School, 1987–88

	Stud/Tea Ratio	Teachers' Years Experience (%) 1–3	4–10	11+
ELEMENTARY				
Askew (SWAS)	22.4	20	32	48
Bell (AOP)	23.0	32	24	44
Berry (AOP)	23.6	24	38	38
Bruce (AOP)	15.3	32	41	26
Burbank (SWAS)	24.1	28	35	37
Burrus (SWAS)	23.5	24	37	39
Codwell (AOP)	21.1	44	22	34
Cornelius (SWAS)	21.2	40	24	36
DeZavala (SWAS) †	23.8	37	42	21
Dodson (SWAS) *	23.9	38	27	35
Dow (SWAS)	24.1	48	26	26
Durham (SWAS)	21.9	30	43	26
Elrod (AOP)	21.3	44	38	17
Garden Villas (AOP)	22.7	22	32	46
Herod (SWAS) †	21.3	44	16	40
Horn (AOP) *	23.8	11	43	46
Jones, A (SWAS)	25.1	22	35	43
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	24.2	45	26	29
Kolter (SWAS)	24.8	28	41	31
Lantrip (SWAS)	23.3	43	20	36
Law (AOP)	22.0	27	27	47
Lockhart (AOP & SWAS)	22.5	30	30	41
Longfellow (AOP) *	21.1	37	20	43
Lovett (AOP & SWAS)	23.8	25	34	41
MacGregor (AOP & SWAS) *	19.9	31	22	47
Oak Forest (SWAS)	24.6	12	24	64
Parker (SWAS)	25.4	13	31	56
Pleasantville (SWAS)	22.3	32	37	32
Poe (AOP) *	20.9	18	30	52
Pugh (AOP)	22.0	58	26	16
Red (SWAS)	22.5	26	24	50
River Oaks (SWAS) *	22.1	23	38	38
Roberts (AOP & SWAS) *	21.8	14	45	41
Rogers, TH (SWAS)	NA	25	44	31
Rogers, W (AOP & SWAS) *	21.1	34	29	37
Roosevelt (SWAS)	25.2	30	40	30
Ross (SWAS)	22.4	19	28	53
Scroggins (SWAS)	19.2	41	27	32
Travis (SWAS) †	23.7	29	32	39

Table 17 Cont'd.

		Stud/Tea Ratio	Teachers' Years Experience (%) 1–3	4–10	11+
	Twain (SWAS) *	22.5	52	17	30
	Wainwright (SWAS)	20.1	22	31	47
	West University (AOP) *	22.6	20	35	45
	Whidby (SWAS) *	25.2	22	11	67
	Wilson (SWAS) *	26.2	20	45	35
	Windsor Village (SWAS)	23.0	22	35	43
MIDDLE					
	Burbank (SWAS)	21.6	32	30	38
	Clifton (AOP & SWAS)	21.7	25	25	50
	CLC (SUS) *	20.8	33	33	33
	Fleming (SWAS)	18.9	32	37	31
	Fondren (SWAS)	22.6	28	25	47
	Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS) *	15.5	35	30	35
	Hamilton (SWAS)	23.6	23	21	55
	Hartman (SWAS)	21.0	37	27	36
	Holland (SWAS) ‡	20.0	29	29	42
	Johnston (SWAS)	21.2	32	25	44
	Lanier (SWAS) *	21.2	30	22	48
	Pershing (SWAS) *	22.5	10	34	55
	Revere (AOP)	23.4	14	43	44
	Ryan (SWAS) †	9.6	14	34	52
	Welch (SWAS)	20.9	10	31	60
SENIOR					
	Austin (SWAS)	22.2	29	28	43
	Bellaire (SWAS)	23.6	19	22	59
	CLC (SUS) *	16.4	23	23	53
	Davis (SWAS)	18.2	38	31	31
	Foley's Academy (SUS)* †	17.2	38	50	13
	Health Professions (SUS) *	14.7	13	19	69
	Jones (SWAS)	20.2	22	33	45
	Jordan (SUS)	18.0	26	39	35
	Lamar (SWAS) *	20.6	25	31	44
	Law Enforcement (SUS)	15.0	33	37	30
	Milby (SWAS)	21.1	27	27	46
	Performing and Visual Arts (SUS)*	16.8	14	39	47
	Reagan (AOP & SWAS)	21.8	20	30	50
	Sterling (SWAS)	21.8	17	23	60
	Washington (SWAS)	20.8	16	25	59
	Yates (SWAS)	20.7	17	28	56

* In-Town Consortium School
† New Magnet Program
‡ First year for Magnet program redirection

Tables 18 and 19 present, by Magnet school or location, the number of Magnet applicants (those who made formal application) who were placed on waiting lists and the number of verbal enrollment denials made by Magnet campus personnel. Magnet coordinators submit to the Magnet Office student's status forms which contain information on students who have been placed on a waiting list. No attempt was made during the year to verify the data submitted by the coordinators or to ensure that all the necessary forms were submitted from every campus. A verbal enrollment denial is a response that the Magnet program is at goal or capacity. This response is made by Magnet school personnel to inquiries about the program. Ethnic breakdowns for verbal enrollment denials should be interpreted with caution as the classifications made by coordinators are often based on telephone conversations.

Because a student may apply to any number of Magnet schools, a student may be represented in this table more than once. The number of unduplicated students who were placed on wait lists or who received verbal enrollment denials cannot be determined.

Table 18
The Number of Verbal Enrollment Denials In-District (HISD)
and Out-of-District (non-HISD) by Race and Ethnicity, 1987–88

	Black		Hispanic		White/Other		Total		Total
	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	
ELEMENTARY									
Askew (SWAS)	2	8	0	1	32	10	34	19	53
Bell (AOP)	36	18	12	2	23	1	71	21	92
Berry (AOP)	8	5	21	0	0	0	29	5	34
Bruce (AOP)	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	17
Burbank (SWAS)	13	20	31	3	0	0	44	23	67
Burrus (SWAS)	35	17	0	5	0	2	35	24	59
Codwell (AOP)	15	9	0	0	0	0	15	9	24
Cornelius (SWAS)	6	18	10	14	4	11	20	43	63
DeZavala (SWAS) †	1	0	4	0	3	0	8	0	8
Dodson (SWAS) *	87	10	43	5	67	11	197	26	223
Dow (SWAS)	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	9
Durham (SWAS)	12	2	1	0	3	0	16	2	18
Elrod (AOP)	23	3	2	1	0	0	25	4	29
Garden Villas (AOP)	112	0	65	0	53	5	230	5	235
Herod (SWAS) †	0	0	1	0	58	0	59	0	59
Horn (AOP) *	38	19	10	1	69	2	117	22	139
Jones, A (SWAS)	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	2	5
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	24	5	3	0	0	0	27	5	32
Kolter (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lantrip (SWAS)	13	0	10	0	6	0	29	0	29
Law (AOP)	3	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	5

Table 18 Cont'd.

	Black		Hispanic		White/Other		Total		Total
	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	
Lockhart (AOP & SWAS)	112	25	5	1	0	1	117	27	144
Longfellow (AOP) *	57	1	17	0	11	0	85	1	86
Lovett (AOP & SWAS)	44	15	3	2	66	37	113	54	167
MacGregor (AOP & SWAS) *	23	1	0	0	0	0	23	1	24
Oak Forest (SWAS)	24	6	17	0	48	15	89	21	110
Parker (SWAS)	23	4	5	0	47	9	75	13	88
Pleasantville (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poe (AOP) *	73	12	0	2	34	3	107	17	124
Pugh (AOP)	0	10	15	0	0	0	15	10	25
Red (SWAS)	5	0	1	0	2	0	8	0	8
River Oaks (SWAS) *	35	31	13	10	244	94	292	135	427
Roberts (AOP & SWAS) *	8	0	0	0	17	2	25	2	27
Rogers, W (AOP & SWAS) *	65	25	35	0	0	0	100	25	125
Roosevelt (SWAS)	17	10	36	4	36	20	89	34	123
Ross (SWAS)	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	4	4
Scroggins (SWAS)	7	1	6	0	0	0	13	1	14
Travis (SWAS) †	2	2	8	1	11	1	21	4	25
Twain (SWAS) *	11	4	0	0	8	0	19	4	23
Wainwright (SWAS)	10	2	6	1	12	7	28	10	38
West University (AOP) *	2	4	0	6	167	28	169	38	207
Whidby (SWAS) *	23	6	3	1	43	12	69	19	88
Wilson (SWAS) *	36	5	30	3	25	0	91	8	99
Windsor Village (SWAS)	0	10	0	0	17	5	17	15	32
MIDDLE									
Burbank (SWAS)	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	7	7
Clifton (AOP & SWAS)	14	7	8	0	7	0	29	7	36
Fleming (SWAS)	0	2	2	1	0	0	2	3	5
Fondren (SWAS)	6	0	0	0	6	0	12	0	12
Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hamilton (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hartman (SWAS)	3	0	6	0	1	0	10	0	10
Holland (AOP) ‡	15	10	23	2	6	6	44	18	62
Johnston (SWAS)	44	2	2	0	85	13	131	15	146
Lanier (SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	11	5	11	5	16
Pershing (SWAS) *	15	1	8	0	15	2	38	3	41
Revere (AOP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ryan (SWAS) †	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rogers, TH (SWAS)	11	6	7	0	22	3	40	9	49
Welch (SWAS)	60	15	2	0	71	2	133	17	150
SENIOR									
Austin (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bellaire (SWAS)	1	2	1	0	3	4	5	6	11

Table 18 Cont'd.

	Black		Hispanic		White/Other		Total		Total
	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	
CLC MS and HS (SUS) *	45	7	3	0	1	1	49	8	57
Davis (SWAS)	7	0	10	0	1	0	18	0	18
Foley's (SUS) * †	24	0	10	0	3	1	37	1	38
Health Professions (SUS) *	8	10	5	6	2	3	15	19	34
Law Enforcement (SUS)	2	7	0	3	1	3	3	13	16
Performing and Visual Arts (SUS) *	5	10	7	8	27	15	39	33	72
Jones (SWAS)	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Jordan (SUS)	34	18	23	12	3	2	60	32	92
Lamar (SWAS) *	15	6	6	3	19	5	40	14	54
Milby (SWAS)	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0
Reagan (AOP & SWAS)	4	4	16	0	2	2	22	6	28
Sterling (SWAS)	16	1	20	0	8	1	44	2	46
Washington (SWAS)	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Yates (SWAS)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

* In-Town Consortium School ‡ First year for Magnet program redirection † New Magnet Program

Table 19
The Number of Students Placed on Waiting Lists and
the Number of Verbal Enrollment Denials by Race and Ethnicity, 1987–88

	Waiting List				Verbal Enrollment Denial				Grand Total			
	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total
ELEMENTARY												
Askew (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	10	1	42	53	10	1	42	53
Bell (AOP)	0	0	0	0	54	14	24	92	54	14	24	92
Berry (AOP)	0	0	0	0	13	21	0	34	13	21	0	34
Bruce (AOP)	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	17	17	0	0	17
Burbank (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	33	34	0	67	33	34	0	67
Burrus (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	52	5	2	59	52	5	2	59
Codwell (AOP)	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	24	24	0	0	24
Cornelius (SWAS)	5	5	1	11	24	24	15	63	29	29	16	74
DeZavala (SWAS) †	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	8	1	4	3	8
Dodson (SWAS) *	76	34	57	167	97	48	78	223	173	82	135	390
Dow (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	9	8	0	1	9
Durham (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	14	1	3	18	14	1	3	18
Elrod (AOP)	0	0	0	0	26	3	0	29	26	3	0	29
Garden Villas (AOP)	0	1	6	7	112	65	58	235	112	66	64	242
Herod (SWAS) †	0	0	0	0	0	1	58	59	0	1	58	59
Horn (AOP) *	21	11	17	49	57	11	71	139	78	22	88	188
Jones, A (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5	2	3	0	5
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	21	0	0	21	29	3	0	32	50	3	0	53

Table 19 contd.

	Waiting List				Verbal Enrollment Denial				Grand Total			
	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total
Kolter (SWAS)	3	3	151	157	0	0	0	0	3	3	151	157
Lantrip (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	13	10	6	29	13	10	6	29
Law (AOP)	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	5	3	2	0	5
Lockhart (AOP & SWAS)	0	0	0	0	137	6	1	144	137	6	1	144
Longfellow (AOP) *	0	0	0	0	58	17	11	86	58	17	11	86
Lovett (AOP & SWAS)	23	1	13	37	59	5	103	167	82	6	116	204
MacGregor (AOP & SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	24	24	0	0	24
Oak Forest (SWAS)	5	5	20	30	30	17	63	110	35	22	83	140
Parker (SWAS)	6	3	38	47	27	5	56	88	33	8	94	135
Pleasantville (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poe (AOP) *	0	0	0	0	85	2	37	124	85	2	37	124
Pugh (AOP)	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	25	10	15	0	25
Red (SWAS)	1	0	5	6	5	1	2	8	6	1	7	14
River Oaks (SWAS) *	10	1	75	86	66	23	338	427	76	24	413	513
Roberts (AOP & SWAS) *	41	9	31	81	8	0	19	27	49	9	50	108
Rogers, TH (SWAS)(39)	0	0	0	0	17	7	25	49	17	7	25	49
Rogers, W (AOP & SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	90	35	0	125	90	35	0	125
Roosevelt (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	27	40	56	123	27	40	56	123
Ross (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	1	3	4
Scroggins (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	8	6	0	14	8	6	0	14
Travis (SWAS) †	0	0	1	1	4	9	12	25	4	9	13	26
Twain (SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	15	0	8	23	15	0	8	23
Wainwright (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	12	7	19	38	12	7	19	38
West University (AOP) *	9	13	12	34	6	6	195	207	15	19	207	241
Whidby (SWAS) *	2	0	0	2	29	4	55	88	31	4	55	90
Wilson (SWAS) *	6	8	5	19	41	33	25	99	47	41	30	118
Windsor Village (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	10	0	22	32	10	0	22	32
MIDDLE												
Burbank (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	7	2	3	2	7
Clifton (AOP & SWAS)	6	11	19	36	21	8	7	36	27	19	26	72
Fleming (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5	2	3	0	5
Fondren (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	12	6	0	6	12
Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS) *	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Hamilton (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hartman (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	10	3	6	1	10
Holland (SWAS) ‡	0	0	0	0	25	25	12	62	25	25	12	62
Johnston (SWAS)	0	2	57	59	46	2	98	146	46	4	155	205
Lanier (SWAS) *	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16	0	0	16	16
Pershing (SWAS) *	2	3	11	16	16	8	17	41	18	11	28	57
Revere (AOP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ryan (SWAS) †	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welch (SWAS)	10	9	28	47	75	2	73	150	85	11	101	197

Table 19 contd.

	Waiting List				Verbal Enrollment Denial				Grand Total			
	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total	Blk	Hisp	W/O	Total
SENIOR												
Austin (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bellaire (SWAS)	13	20	249	282	3	1	7	11	16	21	256	293
CLC MS and HS (SUS) *	0	0	0	0	52	3	2	57	52	3	2	57
Davis (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	7	10	1	18	7	10	1	18
Foley's Academy (SUS) * †	0	0	0	0	24	10	4	38	24	10	4	38
Health Professions (SUS) *	0	0	0	0	18	11	5	34	18	11	5	34
Jones (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2
Jordan (SUS)	13	0	1	14	52	35	5	92	65	35	6	106
Lamar (SWAS) *	12	2	6	20	21	9	24	54	33	11	30	74
Law Enforcement (SUS)	30	0	0	30	9	3	4	16	39	3	4	46
Milby (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4
Performing and Visual Arts (SUS) *	0	0	0	0	15	15	42	72	15	15	42	72
Reagan (AOP & SWAS)	5	15	2	22	8	16	4	28	13	31	6	50
Sterling (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	17	20	9	46	17	20	9	46
Washington (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	3	0	0	3
Yates (SWAS)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1

* In-Town Consortium School
† New Magnet Program
‡ First year for Magnet program redirection

Table 20 presents achievement data for elementary and middle Magnet school students on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6). The scores presented are the reading total and math total median grade equivalent (GE) scores. The first digit of a GE score represents the grade level and the second digit represents the month within the grade. The national average grade equivalent score is the grade level plus 0.7 (seven tenths).

Table 20
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6)
Median Grade Equivalent Scores for Reading Total and Math Total Subtests
by Magnet Program, Spring 1988

	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Askew (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	◊	6.7	7.2	7.9	9.2	10.4	12.7
Bell (AOP)	2.0	2.1	3.0	3.5	4.6	5.1	7.0	7.1	8.2	10.4
Berry (AOP)	1.7	1.8	2.1	2.6	2.5	3.5	3.6	4.7	4.7	5.7
Bruce (AOP)	1.5	1.8	2.2	2.8	2.9	3.6	4.1	4.9	5.0	6.7
Burbank (SWAS)	2.1	2.4	2.9	3.0	3.5	3.9	5.1	4.7	6.0	6.8
Burrus (SWAS)	1.9	2.3	2.9	3.3	3.2	3.7	4.9	5.4	6.8	6.2
Codwell (AOP)	1.6	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.1	4.3	4.2	5.2	6.2	6.9
Cornelius (SWAS)	2.6	2.1	3.5	3.3	5.3	5.1	5.8	7.0	7.0	8.9
DeZavala (SWAS) †	◊	◊	◊	◊	5.7	5.3	6.1	7.4	6.7	7.1
Dodson (SWAS) *	2.5	2.6	4.1	3.4	5.9	5.4	5.9	5.6	6.7	7.8
Dow (SWAS)	1.6	1.8	2.5	3.0	3.3	4.3	5.2	4.7	6.9	8.3
Durham (SWAS)	2.5	2.2	3.2	3.3	4.9	4.8	5.8	6.3	6.0	6.6
Elrod (AOP)	1.5	1.6	2.7	3.2	3.2	3.8	4.9	4.9	5.8	5.8
Garden Villas (AOP)	1.7	2.1	3.2	3.4	3.4	4.3	5.2	5.5	6.3	7.0
Herod (SWAS) †	2.7	2.6	5.7	6.5	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊
Horn (AOP) *	2.6	2.6	3.5	3.6	4.0	4.4	6.8	6.1	8.0	8.5
Jones, A (SWAS)	2.0	3.3	2.7	3.4	3.5	4.4	3.7	4.7	4.9	8.3
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	1.9	2.1	2.9	3.2	3.1	4.0	6.0	5.9	5.5	6.5
Kolter (SWAS)	2.6	2.7	4.6	4.2	4.9	5.0	6.7	6.9	7.8	9.9
Lantrip (SWAS)	2.8	2.5	3.7	3.5	4.9	4.6	6.0	5.3	7.0	7.6
Law (AOP)	1.9	2.2	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.3	4.5	5.0	5.1	7.2
Lockhart (AOP)	1.8	1.9	2.7	2.8	3.6	4.6	4.8	5.3	5.4	7.0
Lockhart (SWAS)	2.0	2.4	3.6	3.6	3.4	4.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	8.3
Longfellow (AOP) *	2.1	2.7	3.3	3.7	3.4	4.4	5.2	5.6	6.9	6.8
Lovett (AOP)	2.3	2.4	3.7	3.7	5.8	5.5	6.1	6.9	8.2	8.9
Lovett (SWAS)	1.9	2.1	3.5	3.6	5.9	5.6	6.5	7.4	8.6	9.6
MacGregor (AOP) *	2.3	2.3	2.8	3.3	4.5	4.5	5.9	5.6	5.7	6.6
MacGregor (SWAS) *	3.0	3.1	3.9	5.1	5.8	4.6	6.9	6.0	5.4	7.4
Oak Forest (SWAS)	3.0	2.5	4.8	3.6	8.0	5.8	7.9	6.1	12.2	8.5
Parker (SWAS)	2.3	2.4	3.4	3.7	5.1	5.4	5.9	6.1	7.2	10.4
Pleasantville (SWAS)	2.8	2.7	3.9	3.8	5.4	5.4	6.8	7.1	8.6	8.3
Poe (SWAS) *	2.3	2.4	3.5	3.3	4.9	5.1	7.0	5.9	8.0	8.1
Pugh (AOP)	1.8	2.2	2.2	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.6	4.7	5.8	7.8

Table 20 Cont'd.

	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Red (SWAS)	1.8	2.1	3.5	4.7	4.5	5.3	6.8	8.4	6.8	8.3
River Oaks (SWAS) *	3.0	3.2	5.6	5.8	7.8	6.5	10.7	8.5	11.2	12.7
Roberts (AOP) *	1.9	1.9	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.9	5.9	6.1	7.8	8.0
Roberts(SWAS) *	2.0	2.0	4.9	4.4	6.0	5.3	7.0	6.5	8.0	8.5
Rogers, TH (SWAS)	4.6	3.6	6.5	5.8	7.8	7.0	8.1	8.2	13.0	11.1
Rogers, W (AOP) *	2.4	2.5	3.0	3.1	4.0	4.5	5.3	5.9	6.0	6.8
Rogers, W (SWAS) *	2.6	2.9	3.1	3.3	4.5	4.5	5.8	5.9	7.6	7.4
Roosevelt (SWAS)	3.0	2.7	4.5	4.9	7.5	7.0	8.1	11.3	10.4	11.8
Ross (SWAS)	1.8	2.1	2.9	3.5	4.1	5.6	4.9	5.8	6.9	7.4
Scroggins (SWAS)	2.0	2.6	3.0	3.4	3.2	4.4	5.9	6.0	6.8	6.9
Travis (SWAS) †	2.5	1.9	3.9	3.7	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊
Twain (SWAS) *	1.9	1.8	3.4	3.3	4.1	4.8	5.2	6.1	6.5	8.2
Wainwright (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	◊	4.9	5.0	7.2	6.7	7.8	9.9
West University (AOP) *	2.9	2.9	4.1	3.8	6.0	5.5	7.9	7.7	8.6	7.8
Whidby (SWAS) *	2.7	2.7	5.2	3.4	5.4	4.7	5.9	5.2	8.2	8.9
Wilson (SWAS) *	2.1	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.8	6.0	5.9	◊	◊
Windsor Village (SWAS)	4.6	3.3	7.2	6.2	7.5	8.4	9.6	8.5	13.0	13.0
Magnet	2.1	2.3	3.1	3.4	4.2	4.8	5.9	6.1	7.0	8.1
District	1.7	2.0	2.7	3.1	3.2	4.2	4.6	5.2	5.4	6.6

	Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Burbank (SWAS)	9.6	11.1	13.0	11.8	13.0	13.0
Clifton (SWAS)	11.1	11.8	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Clifton (AOP)	7.2	8.1	8.7	8.4	11.4	10.8
CLC (SUS) *	5.2	5.8	4.6	6.5	6.8	6.5
Fleming (SWAS)	6.6	8.1	7.3	8.9	9.2	10.5
Fondren (SWAS)	9.1	9.2	◊	◊	◊	◊
Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS) *	7.2	7.5	8.3	8.2	10.7	10.0
Hamilton (SWAS)	10.2	11.8	13.0	11.8	13.0	13.0
Hartman (SWAS)	7.8	8.7	8.7	11.0	13.0	13.0
Holland (SWAS) ‡	8.6	9.6	13.0	11.5	12.2	11.7
Johnston (SWAS)	8.1	9.2	10.5	10.5	12.7	11.9
Lanier (SWAS) *	12.7	12.1	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Pershing (SWAS) *	9.6	9.9	9.9	10.8	13.0	12.6
Revere (AOP)	7.2	8.1	8.9	9.2	12.1	11.0
Ryan (SWAS) †	8.1	8.6	10.5	9.9	10.1	10.7
Rogers, TH (SWAS)	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Welch (SWAS)	7.6	8.7	10.5	12.5	13.0	13.0
Magnet	8.1	9.2	9.9	10.1	13.0	12.1
District	5.8	6.9	6.8	7.2	7.9	8.5

Table 20 Cont'd.

	Grade 9	
	Rdg	Math
Austin (SWAS)	10.2	10.8
Bellaire (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
CLC (SUS) *	7.7	7.3
Davis (SWAS)	8.0	11.9
Foley's Academy (SUS) * †	11.2	7.9
Health Professions (SUS) *	13.0	13.0
Law Enforcement (SUS)	13.0	13.0
Performing and Visual Arts (SUS) *	13.0	13.0
Jones (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Jordan (SUS)	9.1	9.4
Lamar (SWAS) *	13.0	13.0
Milby (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Reagan (AOP)	8.7	9.9
Reagan (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Sterling (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Washington (SWAS)	13.0	13.0
Yates (SWAS)	9.1	9.2
Magnet	13.0	13.0
District	8.3	9.4

◊ No Magnet students at this grade level
* In-Town Consortium School
† New Magnet Program
‡ First year for Magnet program redirection

Comparable Magnet elementary and middle school programs were combined together to compare test scores among the different groups. Six groups were formed: fine arts, math/science, extended day, vanguard, Montessori and miscellaneous. The miscellaneous group contains the Magnet programs which did not fit into the other groups. Listed below are the programs included in each specialty grouping.

FINE ARTS

Elementary		Middle
Bruce (AOP)	Parker (SWAS)	Fleming (SWAS)
Burrus (SWAS)	MacGregor (AOP) *	Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS) *
Garden Villas (AOP)	Poe (AOP) *	Johnston (SWAS)
Longfellow (AOP) *	Roberts (AOP) *	Pershing (SWAS) *
Lovett (AOP)	Scroggins (SWAS)	

MATH/SCIENCE

Elementary		Middle
Berry (AOP)	Pugh (AOP)	Clifton (SWAS)
Cornelius (SWAS)	Red (SWAS)	Fondren (SWAS)
Elrod (AOP)	Ross (SWAS)	Hartman (SWAS)
Lantrip (SWAS)	Wainwright (SWAS)	
Lockhart (AOP)	West University (AOP) *	
Law (AOP)		

VANGUARD

Elementary		Middle
Askew (SWAS)	River Oaks (SWAS) *	Burbank (SWAS)
DeZavala (SWAS) †	Rogers, TH; Gr. 3-8 (SWAS)	Hamilton (SWAS)
Herod (SWAS) †	Roosevelt (SWAS)	Holland (SWAS) ‡
Oak Forest (SWAS)	Travis (SWAS) †	Lanier (SWAS) *
Pleasantville (SWAS)	Windsor Village (SWAS)	Ryan (SWAS) †

MONTESSORI

Elementary
Dodson (SWAS) *
Whidby (SWAS) *

EXTENDED DAY

Elementary	
Burbank (SWAS)	Lovett (SWAS)
Durham (SWAS)	MacGregor (SWAS) *
Dow (SWAS)	Roberts (SWAS) *
Jones, A (SWAS)	Twain (SWAS) *
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	Wilson (SWAS) *
Lockhart (SWAS)	

MISCELLANEOUS

Elementary		Middle
Bell (AOP)	Kolter (SWAS)	Clifton (AOP)
Codwell (AOP)	Roberts (AOP) *	CLC (SUS) *
Horn (AOP) *	Rogers, W (AOP) *	Revere (AOP)
		Welch (SWAS)

* In-Town Consortium School
† New Magnet Program
‡ First year for Magnet program redirection

The reading total and math total median GE scores on the MAT6 by grade level for the Magnet specialty groupings are found in Table 21.

Table 21
Metropolitan Achievement Tests, 6th Edition (MAT6)
Median Grade Equivalent Scores for Reading Total and Math Total Subtests
for Specialty Groupings, Spring 1988

	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Fine Arts	1.9	2.4	3.1	3.3	3.7	4.5	5.7	5.8	6.7	7.6
Math/Science	1.9	2.1	2.8	3.2	3.7	4.5	5.1	5.6	6.1	7.2
Extended Day	2.0	2.3	3.1	3.3	3.7	4.5	5.8	5.8	6.3	7.4
Vanguard	2.9	2.8	5.2	5.0	7.5	6.7	8.1	8.5	11.2	11.1
Montessori	2.6	2.6	4.6	3.4	5.7	5.3	5.9	5.4	7.8	8.2
Miscellaneous	2.0	2.2	3.3	3.5	4.2	4.7	6.0	6.1	7.2	8.3

	Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8	
	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math	Rdg	Math
Fine Arts	8.0	8.7	9.1	9.9	12.7	11.5
Math/Science	8.0	8.7	8.7	11.0	13.0	13.0
Vanguard	11.9	12.1	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Miscellaneous	7.2	8.1	8.7	8.8	11.4	11.0

The percent of students passing each subtest of the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) tests are found in Tables 22, 23, and 24.

Table 22
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS)
Percent of Students Mastering Subtests, Grades 1, 3, and 5, Spring 1988

	Grade 1			Grade 3			Grade 5		
	Math	Read	Write	Math	Read	Write	Math	Read	Write
Askew (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	100	100	94	99	100	100
Bell (AOP)	91	84	85	93	88	89	97	92	94
Berry (AOP)	75	79	73	70	60	61	77	66	36
Bruce (AOP)	70	54	58	71	63	72	96	87	71
Burbank (SWAS)	92	85	92	76	82	79	85	83	82
Burrus (SWAS)	76	75	80	82	76	63	82	82	64
Codwell (AOP)	74	65	70	74	65	62	92	91	78
Cornelius (SWAS)	96	91	96	97	95	93	100	99	89
DeZavala (SWAS) †	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	58
Dodson (SWAS) *	96	89	93	100	96	96	100	95	95

Table 22 Cont'd.

	Grade 1			Grade 3			Grade 5		
	Math	Read	Write	Math	Read	Write	Math	Read	Write
Dow (SWAS)	81	86	79	82	91	83	83	90	89
Durham (SWAS)	96	91	91	98	93	90	87	91	87
Elrod (AOP)	77	67	70	82	74	62	74	82	71
Garden Villas (AOP)	83	74	82	88	79	76	87	84	57
Herod (SWAS) †	100	100	100	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊
Horn (AOP) *	96	92	94	91	85	74	94	91	68
Jones, A (SWAS)	82	94	94	100	89	72	100	100	87
Jones, JW (SWAS) *	96	92	88	86	87	70	82	85	79
Kolter (SWAS)	98	98	98	89	89	87	95	95	86
Lantrip (SWAS)	91	96	100	96	92	73	100	96	96
Law (AOP)	86	84	91	86	88	64	91	76	74
Lockhart (AOP)	84	80	84	94	85	74	89	85	81
Lockhart (SWAS)	100	94	94	95	89	83	100	100	91
Longfellow (AOP) *	97	87	91	90	88	74	87	89	82
Lovett (AOP)	95	94	92	86	98	84	98	96	95
Lovett (SWAS)	95	93	88	88	95	75	97	96	97
MacGregor (AOP) *	93	85	86	95	90	65	84	86	68
MacGregor (SWAS) *	100	88	94	94	100	83	85	85	92
Oak Forest (SWAS)	100	96	96	100	100	92	100	100	100
Parker (SWAS)	98	100	95	97	91	87	98	98	100
Pleasantville (SWAS)	100	100	98	95	98	73	98	100	88
Poe (SWAS) *	87	81	79	82	83	75	93	91	83
Pugh (AOP)	83	76	79	90	73	67	93	94	85
Red (SWAS)	95	79	79	100	86	71	100	80	100
River Oaks (SWAS) *	99	99	98	98	100	92	100	100	100
Roberts (AOP) *	87	78	81	94	91	89	93	92	72
Roberts (SWAS) *	95	84	79	100	90	96	96	96	78
Rogers, TH (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	100	85	100	100	86
Rogers, W (AOP) *	88	91	91	88	84	70	94	88	71
Rogers, W (SWAS) *	90	100	97	91	87	76	97	100	90
Roosevelt (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	100	91	100	100	80
Ross (SWAS)	84	96	88	100	100	100	96	100	70
Scroggins (SWAS)	100	92	84	93	96	64	98	94	96
Travis (SWAS) †	96	96	91	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊
Twain (SWAS) *	82	89	74	82	71	76	96	100	92
Wainwright (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊	94	97	88	100	99	90
West University (AOP) *	98	94	98	96	91	77	94	95	87
Whidby (SWAS) *	100	100	100	93	92	69	100	100	89
Wilson (SWAS) *	89	81	89	96	76	64	84	92	80
Windsor Village (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	100	96	100	100	96
Magnet	89	85	86	89	85	77	92	91	81
District	82	75	76	80	74	66	84	82	70

◊ No Magnet students at this grade level † New Magnet Program * In-Town Consortium School

Table 23
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS)
Percent of Students Mastering Subtests, Grade 7, Spring 1988

	Grade 7		
	Math	Read	Write
Burbank (SWAS)	100	100	98
Clifton (AOP)	95	95	88
Clifton (SWAS)	100	100	100
CLC (SUS) *	68	78	51
Fleming (SWAS)	99	92	91
Fondren (SWAS)	◊	◊	◊
Gregory-Lincoln (SWAS)	*94	95	94
Hamilton (SWAS)	100	99	97
Hartman (SWAS)	100	98	96
Holland (SWAS) ‡	100	100	100
Johnston (SWAS)	97	96	96
Lanier (SWAS) *	100	100	98
Pershing (SWAS) *	99	99	97
Revere (AOP)	90	86	80
Rogers, TH (SWAS)	100	100	100
Ryan (SWAS) †	100	97	92
Welch (SWAS)	100	100	99
Magnet	95	94	90
District	87	83	73

◊ No Magnet students at this grade level
* In-Town Consortium School
† New Magnet Program
‡ First year for Magnet program redirection

Table 24
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS)
Percent of Students Mastering Subtests, Grades 9 and 11, Spring 1988

	Grade 9			Grade 11	
	Math	Read	Write	Math	Lang Arts
Austin (SWAS)	94	85	77	92	100
Bellaire (SWAS)	100	99	94	100	100
CLC (SUS) *	58	61	28	56	71
Davis (SWAS)	87	89	67	85	97
Foley's Academy (SUS) * †	65	80	38	◊	◊
Health Professions (SUS) *	100	99	92	99	100
Law Enforcement (SUS)	99	99	94	99	100
Jones (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	100
Jordan (SUS)	81	77	57	92	97
Lamar (SWAS) *	100	100	83	98	100
Milby (SWAS)	98	96	93	99	99
Perform & Visual Arts (SUS) *	100	100	94	100	100
Reagan (AOP)	80	74	47	82	90
Reagan (SWAS)	100	99	83	100	100
Sterling (SWAS)	100	100	100	100	100
Washington (SWAS)	96	92	88	100	100
Yates (SWAS)	86	87	72	79	91
Magnet	88	86	70	93	97
District	74	71	53	69	87

◊ No Magnet students at this grade level
* In-Town Consortium School
† New Magnet Program
‡ First year for Magnet program redirection

APPENDIX

MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAMS
1987–1988

Elementary

Askew Vanguard (SWAS)
Bell Physical Development (AOP)
Berry Environmental Sciences (AOP)
Bruce Music Academy (AOP)
Burbank Extended Instructional Day (Year-Round) (SWAS)
Burrus Fine Arts Academy (SWAS)
Codwell Skills Academy (Year-Round) (AOP)
Cornelius Math/Science (SWAS)
DeZavala Vanguard (SWAS)
Dodson Montessori (SWAS)
Dow Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Durham Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Elrod Math/Science (AOP)
Garden Villas Music Academy (AOP)
Herod Vanguard (SWAS)
Horn Academy (AOP)
Jones, Anson Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Jones, J Will Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Kolter International Cultures and Communication (SWAS)
Lantrip Environmental Sciences (SWAS)
Law Math/Science (AOP)
Lockhart: 1) Technology (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Longfellow Creative and Performing Arts (AOP)
Lovett: 1) Center of Excellence (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
MacGregor: 1) Music and Science (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Oak Forest Vanguard (SWAS)
Parker Music Academy (SWAS)
Pleasantville Vanguard (SWAS)
Poe Fine Arts (AOP)
Pugh Institute of Fundamental Instruction and Technology (AOP)
Red Math/Science (SWAS)
River Oaks Vanguard (SWAS)
Roberts: 1) Fine Arts/Physical Development (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Rogers, TH Vanguard (SWAS)
Rogers, Will: 1) Educational.Enrichment Center (AOP); 2) Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Roosevelt Vanguard (SWAS)
Ross Math/Science (SWAS)
Scroggins Literature and Art Academy (SWAS)
Travis Vanguard (SWAS)
Twain Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Wainwright Math/Science (SWAS)
West University Math/Science (AOP)
Whidby Montessori (SWAS)
Wilson Extended Instructional Day (SWAS)
Windsor Village Vanguard (SWAS)

Middle

Burbank Vanguard (SWAS)
Clifton: 1) Middle (AOP); 2) Math/Science (SWAS)
Contemporary Learning Center (SUS)
Fleming Fine Arts (SWAS)
Fondren Math/Science (SWAS)
Gregory-Lincoln Fine Arts (SWAS)
Hamilton Vanguard (SWAS)
Hartman Math/Science (SWAS)
Holland Vanguard (SWAS)
Johnston Performing Arts (SWAS)
Lanier Vanguard (SWAS)
Pershing Foreign Language and Fine Arts (SWAS)
Revere Middle (AOP)
Rogers, TH Vanguard (SWAS)
Ryan Vanguard (SWAS)
Welch Physical Development (SWAS)

Senior

Austin Teaching Professions (SWAS)
Bellaire Foreign Language (SWAS)
Contemporary Learning Center (SUS)
Davis Hotel, Restaurant, Travel Careers (SWAS)
Foley's Academy (SUS)
Health Professions High School (SUS)
Jones Vanguard (SWAS)
Jordan Careers (SUS)
Lamar Business Administration (SWAS)
Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (SUS)
Milby Petro-Chemical Careers Institute (SWAS)
Performing & Visual Arts High School (SUS)
Reagan: 1) Computer Assisted Instruction (AOP); 2) Computer Technology (SWAS)
Sterling Aviation Sciences (SWAS)
Washington Engineering Professions (SWAS)
Yates Communications (SWAS)

Cluster Centers

People Place Center (Turner Elementary School)
Children's Literature Center (Briargrove Elementary School)
Outdoor Education Centers: 1) Olympia; 2) Cullen
International Trade Center (Port Houston Elementary School)
Career Orientation Center (Sinclair Elementary School)
Wildlife Discovery Center (Houston Zoo)